

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/391,123	09/07/1999	BYRON HUA CHEN	9-7-4-5	8107
7:	590 01/16/2002			
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR			EXAMINER	
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC 600 MOUNTAIN AVENUE RM 3C 512			CRAVER, CHARLES R	
P O BOX 636 MURRAY HILL, NJ 079740636			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2685	
			DATE MAILED: 01/16/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/391,123

Applicant(s)

Chen et al

Examiner

Charles Craver

Art Unit 2681



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory is specified. 	eation.
communication Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	y statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). The mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This act	cion is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	
Disposition of Claims	
4) 💢 Claim(s) <u>1-14</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢 Claim(s) <u>1-14</u>	
7) Claim(s)	
	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers	
9) X The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on Sep 7, 1999 is/are	objected to by the Examiner.
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) \square All b) \square Some* c) \square None of:	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority de application from the International Bure *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	
	•
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. 9 119(e).
Attachment(s)	ADI THE STATE OF T
5) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) X Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
17 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:
77 Internation discussife statement of the terror repet Notal.	ZO/ CUBI.

Art Unit: 2681

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 1, line 17, a US Patent Application Serial Number must be entered.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Reference number "10", page 1 lines 29-30.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Reference number "13", FIG 1.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2681

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Westcott et al, US Pat 6,298,083.

Regarding claim 1,

Westcott discloses a method for detecting a plurality of signals (col 3 line 66-col 4 line 53), comprising the steps of

measuring a strength of signals transmitted on frequencies associated with a signal to be detected,

determining an integration time based on said signal strength (col 7 line 65-col 8 line 36), and

finding the signal to be detected using a correlator for a given integration time (col 4 lines 16-29, col 5 lines 26-36, col 6 line 66-col 7 line 16).

Regarding claim 2,

Westcott discloses that a shorter search is used when a stronger signal is present (col 5 lines 29-33), based on the weighted number and time calculated for the integration time (col 8 lines 4-19), which reads an inverse relation.

Regarding claims 3 and 4,

Westcott discloses that the integration time may be calculated using a mathematical equation (col 8 lines 4-14), or using a statistical model (col 7 lines 46-52), which reads as a curve.

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claims 5 and 6,

The integration period must inherently have a minimum number of cycles and a maximum

number of cycles in order to properly enable a correlation to take place; thus, since such a

minimum and maximum would correspond to a given value of signal strength, such values are

read as thresholds.

Regarding claim 7,

Westcott discloses that the signals received are estimated, given that the process is for

searching within a frequency range so as to lock onto a wanted signal (col 1 lines 47-54, col 4

lines 44-62, col 56 lines 16-35).

Regarding claim 10,

Westcott discloses that the received frequency may differ from the original frequency by

Doppler shift (col 1 lines 30-46); as such, in the case that such a shift is minimized, the received

frequency would be experimentally equal to that which was transmitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2681

7. Claims 8, 9 and 11 ares rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westcott as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the applicant's disclosure of prior art.

Page 5

Regarding claim 8,

While disclosing applicant's invention of claim 7 as shown above, Westcott does not expressly disclose that the estimated frequency is based on a reference point within a sector in which a receiver is located. However, the applicant admits as prior art such a system, specifically a WAG system (page 5 lines 3-18), in which such a presupposition of a needed frequency is based on receiver location in order to save time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize such a step in the GPS signal capturing method of Westcott, as Westcott discloses that the longer it takes to lock on to a signal, the more time and energy is wasted (col 2 lines 31-54).

Regarding claim 9,

While disclosing applicant's invention of claim 1 as shown above, Westcott does not expressly disclose that the estimated frequency is based on a received search message. However, the applicant admits as prior art such a system, specifically a WAG system (page 5 lines 12-18), in which such a presupposition of a needed frequency is based on information received from a WAG server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize such a step in the GPS signal capturing method of Westcott, as Westcott discloses that the longer it takes to lock on to a signal, the more time and energy is wasted (col 2 lines 31-54).

Application/Control Number: 09/391123

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claim 11,

The applicant further recites that the GPS receiver may use more than one GPS satellite

signal to determine location (page 2 lines 7-14 and 25-32). In such a case, a second signal would

be received, integrated and correlated in the same manner as the first signal.

8. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Westcott as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Zhodzishsky et al, US Pat 6,313,789.

Regarding claim 12,

While disclosing applicant's invention of claim 1 above, Westcott does not disclose that a

power spectrum density ratio is taken into account when determining the integration time.

Zhodzishsky states that the width of a GPS signal tracking window (col 2 line 23-col 3

line 30) such as that taught by Westcott varies with the ratio of the signal power to the spectral

density (col 43 lines 11-29).

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to add such a calculation to the equation of Westcott; given that such a ratio affects the

integration window, acknowledging such an effect would provide for a more exact estimate of the

needed integration time, and thus avoid the need to redo the act of integrating and correlating to

capture a signal to which a lock was not properly made.

Page 6

Art Unit: 2681

Regarding claims 13 and 14,

It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that, since a low ratio implies a lower-quality signal and thus a longer integration time would be necessary in such a situation, to use said ratio in the calculation of the integration time such that a low ratio implies a

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Litton et al discusses a GPS receiver.

Camp, Jr. et al discusses GPS reception utilizing different integration times.

longer integration time and a higher ratio implies a shorter integration time.

Counselman III discusses GPS signal reception.

11. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9314 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2681

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, sixth floor (receptionist).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Craver whose telephone number is (703) 305-3965.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Urban, can be reached on (703) 305-4385.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

C. Craver January 11, 2002

Ellen